



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,736	09/30/2004	Lee George Laborczfalvi	2006579-0242	5735
69665	7590	02/04/2009	EXAMINER	
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART / CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC.			NGUYEN, BAO S	
TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BOSTON, MA 02110			4112	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/04/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/711,736	Applicant(s) LABORCZFALVI ET AL.
	Examiner BAO NGUYEN	Art Unit 4112

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 September 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/06/04, 5/18/06, 4/15/08
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim **2, 3, 7, and 8** are objected to because of the following informalities: step "c" and "d" mentioned in these claims do not exist. Appropriate correction is required. The examiner assumes that step "c" is the last paragraph in claim 1 and step "d" is in claim 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims **1-3, 11** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Alford, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,027,051), hereinafter referenced as Alford.

Regarding **Claim 1**, Alford discloses a method for presenting an aggregate view of native resources (figure 9), the method comprising the steps of: enumerating a plurality of system-scoped native resources ("CPU", "memory", and "disk I/O", figure 9) provided by a system scope; enumerating a plurality of application-scoped native resources provided by an

application isolation scope ("CPU", "memory", and "disk I/O" usage per application, figure 9), some of the plurality of application-scoped resources corresponding to some of the plurality of system-scoped resources; determining, for one of the plurality of system-scoped resources, the existence of a corresponding one of the plurality of application-scoped resources; and including the corresponding one of the plurality of application-scoped resources in an aggregate view of native resources (For example, resource utilization for "DB1", "users", and "Websphere" applications are shown as "CPU", "memory", and "disk I/O" usage, as shown in figure 9).

Regarding **claim 2**, Alford discloses everything as in claim 1 rejection. Alford also discloses one of the plurality of system-scoped resources, that a corresponding one of the plurality of application-scoped resources does not exist (In figure 9, there is an entry "system" with resource usage that do not correspond to any application).

Regarding **claim 3**, Alford discloses everything as in claim 2 rejection. Alford also discloses adding the entries to the aggregate view of native resources (entry "system" in figure 9).

Regarding **claim 11**, Alford discloses the step of intercepting, by one of a file system driver, a mini-driver, a user mode hooking mechanism, and a kernel mode hooking mechanism, a request to enumerate a file system comprising system-scoped resources (Disk I/O in figure 9, also "...the display is for a resource in the form of a file system storage space, a central processing unit (CPU) and a memory device on a UNIX based data processing system", column 5, line 39-42. It is also inherent that the displayed file system resource must be captured by file system driver, a mini-driver, a user mode hooking mechanism, or a kernel mode hooking mechanism).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 4-6, 9, and 10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alford, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,027,051), hereinafter referenced

Art Unit: 4112

as Alford, in view of Tachihara et al. (U. S. patent application publication no 2004/0249937), hereinafter referenced as Tachihara.

Regarding **claim 4**, Alford everything as in claim 1 rejection. However, Alford fails to disclose an aggregate view enumerating a plurality of user-scoped native resources provided by a user isolation scope, some of the plurality of user-scoped resources corresponding to some of the plurality of system-scoped resources.

However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art that there is a method that provides an aggregate view of system resource per user, as taught by Tachihara.

In a similar field of endeavor, Tachihara discloses a system performance method that display an aggregate view of system resource ("Server 1", "Storage 2",...) per user ("User ID"), as disclosed in figure 23.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Alford by adding the system resource utilization per user, as taught by Tachihara. This modification allows Alford's invention to provide an aggregate view of system resources for both user and application levels.

Regarding **claim 5**, Alford and Tachihara disclose everything as in claim 4 rejection. Alford also discloses for one of the plurality of system-scoped resources, that a corresponding one of the plurality of user-scoped resources does not exist (In figure 9, there is an entry "system" with resource usage that do not correspond to any application. With the combination of Tachihara and Alford in claim 4 rejection, Alford can display an entry "system" with resource usage that does not correspond to any user).

Regarding **claim 6**, Alford and Tachihara disclose everything as in claim 4 rejection. They also disclose including the one of the plurality of system-scoped resources in an aggregate view of system-scoped resources (see claim 3 rejection).

Regarding **claim 9**, Alford and Tachihara disclose everything as in claim 4 rejection. They also disclose for one of the plurality of system-scoped resources, that a corresponding one of the plurality of user-scoped resources indicates the resource is deleted (see claim 7's rejection).

Regarding **claim 10**, Alford discloses everything as in claim 7 rejection. The examiner take official notice that it is well known in the art if an entry does not

have any value, the system can be programmed not to show the entry in the view (see claim 8 rejection).

3. **Claim 12** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alford, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,027,051), hereinafter referenced as Alford, in view of Rachman et al. (U. S. patent application publication no. 2004/0230971), hereinafter referenced as Rachman.

Regarding **claim 12**, Alford disclose everything as in claim 1 rejection. However, Alford fails to disclose the step of intercepting a request to enumerate a plurality of registry entries.

However, the examiner maintains that it was well known in the art that there is a method that captures and lists a plurality of registry entries for an application, as taught by Rachman.

In a similar field of endeavor, Rachman discloses an application manager that "gets the list of all registry entries that were created during the installation process and fixes all files associations that were created", as disclosed in paragraph 0065.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Alford by adding the application manager to obtain the list of registry entries and add them into the view in figure 9 or 10 (i.e. a new column with list of registry entries) that list all the registry for each application, as taught by Rachman. This modification allows Alford's invention to view the registry entries for each application.

4. **Claims 7 and 8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alford, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,027,051), hereinafter referenced as Alford.

Regarding **claim 7**, Alford discloses everything as in claim 1 rejection. Alford also discloses the bar view indicates the values for system resource utilization. However, Alford fails to specifically disclose that for one of the plurality of system-scoped resources, a corresponding one of the plurality of application-scoped resources indicates the resource is deleted.

The examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the art if the application does not used a particular system resource (i.e. the resource is deleted), the view can be modified to specifically indicate a particular resource is deleted. The view in Alford's figure 9 can be modified to specifically indicate a particular resource is deleted for an application instead of showing no value for

deleted resources. The modification will improve the view by clearly indicating the resource for the application is deleted vs. the resource is not used.

Regarding **claim 8**, Alford discloses everything as in claim 7 rejection. However, Alford fails to disclose removing the system-scoped resource from the aggregate view of system-scoped resources if it is not used by any application.

The examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the art if an entry does not have any value (i.e. an application does not have any corresponding system resource, as in figure 9), the system can be programmed not to show the entry in the view. Alford's bar view can be programmed not to report the system-scoped resources if it is not used by any application. The modification will improve the view by not showing the system resources if they are not used by any application or user.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BAO NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)270-7240. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 AM - 4:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jefferey Harold can be reached on 571-272-7519. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/BAO NGUYEN/
Examiner, Art Unit 4112

1/30/2009

/Jefferey F Harold/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4112